

**ENTERED**

March 10, 2025

Nathan Ochsner, Clerk

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF TEXAS  
CORPUS CHRISTI DIVISION

ALEX ADAMS,

Plaintiff,

VS.

UNITED STATES POSTAL SERVICE, *et*  
*al.*,

Defendants.

§  
§  
§  
§  
§  
§  
§  
§  
§  
§

CIVIL ACTION NO. 2:23-CV-00076


**ORDER ADOPTING MEMORANDUM AND RECOMMENDATION  
OF UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE**

On February 7, 2025, United States Magistrate Judge Mitchel Neurock issued his “Memorandum and Recommendation of United States Magistrate Judge” (D.E. 87), recommending that this Court deny Plaintiff’s request to proceed *in forma pauperis* on appeal (D.E. 86). Plaintiff was provided proper notice of, and opportunity to object to, the Magistrate Judge’s memorandum and recommendation. Fed. R. Civ. P. 72(b); 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1); General Order No. 2002-13. No objections have been timely filed.

When no timely objection to a magistrate judge’s memorandum and recommendation is filed, the district court need only satisfy itself that there is no clear error on the face of the record and accept the magistrate judge’s memorandum and recommendation. *Guillory v. PPG Indus., Inc.*, 434 F.3d 303, 308 (5th Cir. 2005) (citing *Douglass v. United Servs. Auto Ass’n*, 79 F.3d 1415, 1420 (5th Cir. 1996)).

Having reviewed the findings of fact and conclusions of law set forth in the Magistrate Judge's memorandum and recommendation (D.E. 87), and all other relevant documents in the record, and finding no clear error, the Court **ADOPTS** as its own the findings and conclusions of the Magistrate Judge. Accordingly, the Court **DENIES** Plaintiff's request to proceed *in forma pauperis* on appeal (D.E. 86).

**ORDERED** on March 10, 2025.

  
NELVA GONZALES RAMOS  
UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE